

REMARKS

Claims 1-41 are pending. New claims 39-41 have been added to cover a system and method "wherein access is restricted to the marketing role of the user as defined by role information of the user." Support for this amendment can be found, for example, on page 16, lines 8-18 of the application. No new matter has been added.

Drawing sheets labeled FIGS. 2 and 4 have been corrected for certain informalities as suggested by the Examiner. No new matter has been added.

In view of the above drawing corrections and the following remarks, we request withdrawal of each of the rejections and allowance of the application.

Specification

The specification was objected to for informalities.

The drawing sheet labeled FIG. 2 has been corrected by adding the reference "100" so that the drawing is consistent with the text process flow "100" on page 7, line 4 of the specification.

The drawing sheet labeled FIG. 4 has been corrected by replacing the text "Customer Analysis" with the text "Marketing Analysis." This correction is supported by page 10, line 2 of the specification.

The drawing sheet labeled FIG. 4 also has been corrected by adding the text "Industry news." This correction is supported by page 10, line 4 of the specification.

In view of the above corrections and remarks, the applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objections to the specification.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC §103

Claims 1-38 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over MarketFirst Announces Initial Customer availability of MarketFirst Release 2.0 (Hereinafter the MarketFirst publication) in view of US Patent no. 6,334,110 B1 issued to Walter et al. (Hereinafter the Walter patent).

We submit, however, that the MarketFirst publication neither describes nor suggests a system that includes “two respective **role portals** corresponding to at least two of the **marketing roles** within the marketing organization.”

Rather, the MarketFirst publication describes a system that provides information to users **without** mentioning “two respective **role portals** corresponding to at least two of the **marketing roles** within the marketing organization” as recited in claim 1. Instead, the MarketFirst publication describes a system that includes:

“[a]n integrated MarketFirst Calendar which provides marketing organizations with a high-level, graphical view of programs and campaigns. The calendar tracks programs by month, quarter, and year. Using the calendar feature, **users and marketing managers can review** programs that are in any phase of development or implementation.” (Emphasis added)

(See page 2, lines 12-19) In other words, the system appears to allow **all** users to review marketing information, without making a distinction between users based on their role in the marketing organization. Clearly, the system does **not** provide a “role portal” based on the marketing role of the user as recited in claim 1. Although the system of the MarketFirst publication may be able to provide users with information, the system appears to be unable to control the information they receive. For example, the system may be unable to provide an executive with high-level information without burdening the executive with low-level information. Likewise, the system may provide a marketing manager with both high and low-level information, burdening the manager with the high-level information which may be irrelevant to the role of the manager. The current application has identified that such a system may be undesirable because it may deluge users with unnecessary information un-related to their marketing roles. Indeed, the current application addresses this problem by providing a “role portal” based on the marketing role of the user so that only information that is relevant to a user is provided without inundating the user with irrelevant information. The use of this technique may provide other advantages including allowing users to perform their jobs more efficiently and reducing the time to develop, analyze and launch marketing campaigns. (See page 4, lines 1-7 of the application)

For at least this reason alone, we submit that claim 1 is patentable over the MarketFirst publication. We further submit that because claims 2-17 depend from claim 1, these dependent claims are patentable for at least the same reasons that independent claim 1 is patentable.

In addition, we submit that the Walter patent adds nothing to those features found to be lacking in the MarketFirst publication. That is, the Walter patent, alone or in combination with the MarketFirst publication, neither teaches nor suggests a system that “a role portal component for providing at least two respective role portals corresponding to at least two of the marketing roles within the marketing organization” as recited in claim 1.

Likewise, we submit that the MarketFirst publication, alone or in combination with the Walter patent, does not teach or suggest a system that includes “a role portal component for providing at least two respective role portals corresponding to at least two of the marketing roles within the marketing organization” as recited in claim 18. Thus, claim 18 is allowable over the MarketFirst publication and dependent claims 19-28 should be allowable for at least the same reasons that claim 18 is allowable.

Similarly, we submit that the MarketFirst publication, alone or in combination with the Walter patent, does not teach or suggest a method providing a system that includes “a role portal component for providing at least two respective role portals corresponding to at least two of the marketing roles within the marketing organization” as recited in claim 29. Thus, claim 29 is allowable over the MarketFirst publication and dependent claims 30-38 should be allowable for at least the same reasons that claim 29 is allowable.

Consequently, we request withdrawal of the 35 USC 103(a) rejection of the claims.

New Claims

New claim 39 (which is dependent on independent claim 1) has been added to recite a system “wherein access is restricted to the marketing role of the user as defined by role information of the user.” We respectively submit that the MarketFirst publication neither describes nor suggests a system that includes a role portal component and a workbench component permitting a user access to metric and workflow information associated with the marketing role, “wherein access is restricted to the marketing role of the user as defined by role information of the user” as recited in amended claim 39.

Rather, the MarketFirst publication describes a system that provides marketing information to different users **without** restricting access to the information based on the marketing role of the user. For example, users and marketing managers can review marketing programs during phases of development. (See page 2, lines 15-19 of the MarketFirst publication) Consequently, an executive interested in a high level view of a marketing campaign may be burdened with low-level information that may not be relevant to the role of the executive. Likewise, a marketing manager accessing low-level information may be burdened with high-level information having little bearing on the role of the marketing manager. As a result, such a system may deluge users with unnecessary information un-related to their roles, leading to inefficiencies.

The present application recognized and addressed this problem by providing techniques that restrict access to information based on the role of the user. Such restriction may provide advantages such as preventing a user from being deluged with irrelevant information, improving user efficiencies. (See page 16, lines 8-18 of the application) In other words, the MarketFirst publication provides un-restricted access, whereas the current application controls access to information "wherein access is restricted to the marketing role of the user as defined by role information of the user" as recited in claim 39. For at least this reason alone, we submit that claim 39 is patentable over the MarketFirst publication. Moreover, we submit that the MarketFirst publication, alone or in combination with the Walter patent, does not teach or suggest such a feature.

In a similar manner, new claim 40 (which is dependent on independent system claim 18) and new claim 41 (which is dependent on independent method claim 29) have been added that include the features of claim 39. We further submit that claims 40 and 41 should be allowable for at least the same reasons as claims 18, and 29, respectively.